

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

		•		
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/681,076	12/22/2000	Wm. Troy Tack		9505
27007 75	590 10/23/2002			
TRI-KOR ALLOYS, LLC 3060 WASHINGTON RD. RTE. 97 SUITE 255 GLENWOOD, MD 21738			EXAMINER	
			WESSMAN, ANDREW E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1742	P
			DATE MAILED: 10/23/2002	(1)

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1	Ammliac4: N					
14	Application No.	icant(s)				
Office Action Summer	09/681,076	TACK ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Andrew E Wessman	1742				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	1. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reserve within the statutory minimum of thirty and will expire SIX (6) MON tute. Cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication.				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·					
_	This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 22-39 is/are pending in the applica	tion.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>22-39</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acc						
Applicant may not request that any objection to t	the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on		sapproved by the Examiner.				
If approved, corrected drawings are required in r						
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prication from the International B * See the attached detailed Office action for a lis 	ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))	,				
14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes						
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language present is made of a claim for domes 	rovisional application has be	en received.				
Attachment(s)	· · · · ·	•				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of In	ummary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) formal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
J.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 04-01) Office A	Action Summary	Part of Paper No. 7				

Art Unit: 1742

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. Claims 1-21 have been cancelled and replaced with new claims 22-39.
- 2. In view of the newly submitted claims, the previous rejections and objections to the claims are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 22-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,221,377).

Hunt, Jr. et al. teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Hunt, Jr. et al. teaches (see abstract) an aluminum alloy having 7.6 to 8.4 wt% zinc, 1.8 to 2.2 wt% magnesium, 2 to 2.6 wt% copper, and up to 0.5 wt% of at least one of zirconium, vanadium, and hafnium. Hunt, Jr. et al. also teaches the alloy having a yield strength of over 84 ksi, and also shows alloys having yield strength of over 90 ksi (see Table 4, cols. 13 and 14). Hunt, Jr. et al. then teaches forming the alloy using casting (col. 5, lines 42-43), and that the alloy may be formed using processes including extrusion, forging, and rolling (col. 5, lines 44-45). Hunt, Jr. et al. then also teaches (col. 5, line 53 to col. 6, line 16) solution heat treating, quenching, and artificial aging the alloy. Hunt, Jr. et al. also teaches (col. 5, lines 59-60). The alloys disclosed by Hunt, Jr. et al. (see

Art Unit: 1742

abstract) are primarily of the Al-Zn-Mg-Cu type, as in applicant's claimed invention of claims 33-39.

Hunt, Jr. et al. does not teach using the alloy to create lightweight alloy stock for manufacturing gun frames and gun components. However, this is considered an intended use for the alloy stock and is therefore given little patentable weight. It is known in the art to use aluminum alloys to make gun components, as shown in the previous office action reference to a Bushmaster Arms catalog (see paper No. 3, paragraph 9). One of ordinary skill in the aluminum processing art would be aware of disclosures such as that of Hunt, Jr. et al., which teaches substantially the same aluminum alloy and processing steps. The final product made by the processes has little bearing on the patentability of the claims, as the principles applied to forming all manner of products are based on the materials used and not the shape of the final product desired. Because the alloys of Hunt, Jr. et al. and the claimed invention utilize the same processing steps and the same alloy composition, one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected the alloys of Hunt, Jr. et al. to be functional in the gun components of the claimed invention.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In regards to the material submitted to show the commercial success of the present invention, the material has been considered but is not persuasive as to the patentability of the claims. The materials presented by applicant do not specifically

Art Unit: 1742

mention the invention, but simply show that aluminum-scandium alloys are being used with some success by Smith and Wesson. Applicant's claimed invention is of much broader scope than the aluminum-scandium alloys, and so applicant's arguments are not of the same scope as the claims. Furthermore, there is no further information about the aluminum-scandium alloys used by Smith and Wesson to show that they are indeed of the type of applicant's claimed invention. The materials presented and further information showing that the materials are solely directed towards the claimed invention should be submitted in the form of a declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 (see Manual of Patent Examining Procedure 716).

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1742

Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew E Wessman whose telephone number is (703)305-3163. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (703)308-1146. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)872-9310 for regular communications and (703)872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0661.

ROY KING

AEW October 18, 2002 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700